

## REMARKS

This application pertains to a novel heat activable thermoplastic hot-melt adhesive which is useful for bonding electrical modules to card bodies and is activated at implanting temperatures of 150°C.

Claims 1-8 are pending.

The claims have been amended to more specifically recite that the adhesive sheet is **heat activable**. Support for this limitation can be found throughout the specification, especially at page 3, line 8; page 4, lines 2 and 6 and page 7, line 8. No new matter is added.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Feichtmeier et al (U.S. 6,350,791) and further in view of Kelch et al. (U.S. 2002/0068182).

The Examiner acknowledges that the Feichtmeier reference does not disclose using a copolymer in its thermosettable adhesive with the instantly claimed properties, and turns to Kelch for a disclosure of GRILTEX® 9 copolyester. The Examiner contends that it would be obvious to use Kelch's GRILTEX® 9 copolyester in Feichtmeier's adhesive composition to impart improved rheological properties.

Applicants' have already pointed out that it is not taught or suggested in Kelch that adhesives based on GRILTEX 9 could be heat-activated in any way. By contrast,

those skilled in the art would recognize that the Kelch multilayer films comprising a PE layer and two adhesives would not be expected to be heat-activable: Prior to the adhesive layers becoming adhesive, the PE core of the tape would be expected to melt away. Therefore, the Kelch tapes are not applicable as heat-activable adhesive films.

Applicants also previously pointed out that there is no reason why any person skilled in the art would add GRILTEX 9 to the Feichtmeier adhesives, as the Examiner proposes, and there is no reason why those skilled in the art would "modify" the adhesive compositions of Feichtmeier et al with GRILTEX<sup>®</sup> 9, as the Examiner suggests.

In response to this argument, the Examiner now argues back that GRILTEX<sup>®</sup> 9 was a co polyester such as that mentioned by Feichtmeier at C5, L45-50, and the properties mentioned in paragraph 0030 of Kelch (the melting point) meet the properties recited in Feichtmeier for his polyesters at C 5, lines 55-60. Nevertheless, it must once again be pointed out that it is not taught or suggested in Kelch that adhesives based on GRILTEX 9 could be heat-activated in any way.

Furthermore, it is respectfully pointed out that Applicants' adhesive sheet is *thermoplastic* (see page 1, line 10 and claim 1), not thermosettable like that of Feichtmeier. Nothing in Feichtmeier teaches or suggests that the addition of GRILTEX<sup>®</sup> 9 would convert Feichtmeier's thermosettable adhesive to a thermoplastic, and certainly there is nothing in Feichtmeier that would give any person any reason to substitute a thermoplastic adhesive for his thermosettable adhesive.

Clearly, no combination of Feichtmeier and Kelch could therefore ever lead to Applicants novel heat activable adhesive sheets, and the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Feichtmeier et al (U.S. 6,350,791) and further in view of Kelch et al. (U.S. 2002/0068182) should therefore now be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Feichtmeier et al (U.S. 6,350,791) in view of Kelch et al (U.S. 2002/0068182) and further in view of Vieilledent (U.S. 4,701,236).

The reasons why the addition of Kelch's GRILTEX® 9 to the Feichtmeier et al compositions could never lead to Applicants' novel heat activable adhesives are discussed above. The Examiner turns to Vieilledent for a teaching of thickness of adhesive. No thickness of adhesive could ever overcome the deficiencies of the Kelch/Feichtmeier combination of references, as discussed above.

The rejection of claims 2 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Feichtmeier et al (U.S. 6,350,791) in view of Kelch et al (U.S. 2002/0068182) and further in view of Vieilledent (U.S. 4,701,236) should therefore now be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Feichtmeier et al (U.S. 6,350,791) in view of Kelch et al (U.S. 2002/0068182) and further in view of Haghiri-Tehrani (U.S. 4,897,534). The reasons why the addition of Kelch's GRILTEX® 9 to the Feichtmeier et al compositions could never lead to Applicants' novel heat activable adhesives are discussed above. The Examiner turns to the Haghiri-Tehrani reference for a method of using an adhesive to secure a chip to a card. Nothing in the Haghiri-Tehrani could ever overcome the deficiencies of the Kelch/Feichtmeier combination of references, as discussed above. Therefore, no combination of Feichtmeier et al, Kelch et al and Haghiri-Tehrani could ever lead to Applicants' novel adhesive sheets.

The rejection of claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Feichtmeier et al (U.S. 6,350,791) in view of Kelch et al (U.S. 2002/0068182) and further in view of Haghiri-Tehrani (U.S. 4,897,534) should therefore now be withdrawn.

In view of the present remarks, it is believed that claims 1-8 are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of said claims by the Examiner is respectfully requested, and the allowance thereof is courteously solicited.

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If any extension of time for this amendment is required, Applicants request that this be considered a petition therefor. Please charge the required petition fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fee or credit any excess to deposit Account No. 14-1263

Respectfully submitted

NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS

By /William C. Gerstenzang/  
William C. Gerstenzang  
Reg. No. 27,552

WCG:tmh

875 Third Avenue  
18<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10022  
(212) 808-0700